

Hello,

I am a resident of Wethersfield, CT and I wish to provide testimony on two bills for the Connecticut General Assembly Judiciary Committee Public Hearing on Friday, March 5, 2021 at 10:00 A.M.

I OPPOSE HB 6355 AN ACT CONCERNING RISK PROTECTION ORDERS OR WARRANTS.

While I fundamentally disagree with Connecticut's existing Extreme Risk Protection orders, the proposed bill is even more damaging and ripe for abuse. When it comes to seizing guns through a petition, the standards that a judge uses should be high, require facts and investigation that show "an imminent and extreme risk" like under current law. Allowing people to directly petition the court bypasses that fact gathering and investigation by the police. Police will be involved when serving a firearm seizure warrant. The police response will be even greater if not involved from the initiation of the complaint since they will have had no prior encounter with the individual.

Unfortunately, fraudulent risk protection order claims happen in Connecticut. And when they happen, no one is prosecuted for perjury. Former partners, family members and roommates with a grudge or seeking revenge could use this against someone. There should be a penalty and prosecution for maliciously false accusations.

I SUPPORT HB 6491 AN ACT PERMITTING PERSONS TO PROTECT THEMSELVES USING NONLETHAL DEFENSIVE INSTRUMENTS.

In 2013, Jaime Caetano of Massachusetts found herself homeless and in fear of her life after an altercation with an abusive boyfriend that put her in the hospital. Multiple restraining orders against her abuser, proved futile. When a friend offered Caetano a stun gun for self-defense, she accepted. After leaving work, Caetano's abuser was waiting for her. She displayed the stun gun and the abusive ex-boyfriend fled. However, under Massachusetts law the possession of the stun gun is a crime. When police discovered she had a stun gun, she was arrested and convicted. In 2016 the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously vacated the conviction of a Caetano.

The Court has held that the Second Amendment extends, to all instruments that constitute bearable arms, even those that were not in existence at the time of the founding. Connecticut laws should not go against United States Supreme Court rulings. If the fundamental right of self-defense does not include stun guns, then the safety of Connecticut residents is left to the mercy of state legislators that may be more concerned about disarming the people than about keeping them safe

Sincerely,

Martin Grabeck